

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
 10/040,055	12/31/2001	James K. Falbo	NTI-030	1929
29477	7590 06/16/2004		EXAMINER	
BEVER HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP			ROSSOSHEK, YELENA	
1432 CONCANNON BLVD BLDG G			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LIVERMORE	E, CA 94550-6006		2825	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/040,055	FALBO ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Helen B Rossoshek	2825				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the c ver sheet with the	correspondenc address				
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding arm the shortened statutory period for replace that than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		• -				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>11,33 and 37-43</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12-32,34-36 and 44-54</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	,					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner				
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer						
10. Other:	(A) (1 10 1440) 1 apoi 140(0).	MarlISul				
	SUi T	MATTHEW SMITH \ PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation and term "layout imperfection" of the claims is very broad and even the Specification does not give clear definition. The phraseology of the specification, especially paragraph{0004} leaves enough space for the interpretation the layout imperfection as a defect, which is a subject for a modification by OPC process, since "these layout imperfections are not necessarily defects", but may be are defects.